

# Marking criteria and feedback forms 2018-19

---

## ***Department of Life Sciences – Biochemistry, Biological Sciences, Biology and Biotechnology degrees***

### **Contents**

Contents.....	1
Essays: assessment criteria .....	2
Essay: report and feedback.....	3
Laboratory reports: assessment criteria .....	4
Laboratory report: report and feedback.....	5
Posters: assessment criteria .....	6
Poster: report and feedback .....	7
Presentations: assessment criteria .....	8
Presentation: report and feedback.....	9
Dissertations: assessment criteria .....	10
<i>Tutored Dissertation</i> : Tutor's report and feedback .....	11
<i>Tutored Dissertation</i> : Second Marker's report and feedback.....	13
<i>Research Project and Literature Project</i> vivas: assessment criteria.....	15
<i>Research Project and Literature Project</i> presentation and viva: report.....	16
<i>Literature Project</i> : Supervisor/Examiner's report .....	18
<i>Research Project</i> theses: assessment criteria .....	19
<i>Research Project</i> thesis: Examiner's report .....	20
<i>Research Project</i> lab/field-work performance: assessment criteria .....	21
<i>Research Project</i> : Supervisor's report.....	22
<i>Literature Project</i> lay summary: assessment criteria .....	24
<i>Literature Project</i> lay summary: report.....	25
<i>Year in Industry/Research, Year in Research Abroad, and Language for Science</i> project report: assessment criteria .....	26
<i>Year in Industry/Research, Year in Research Abroad, and Language for Science</i> project report: report and feedback.....	27
<i>Year in Research Abroad</i> cultural report: assessment criteria.....	28
<i>Year in Research Abroad</i> cultural report: report and feedback.....	29

## Essays: assessment criteria

These criteria are for both exam and coursework essays. Account will be taken of what can reasonably be expected in the time available in an exam, within a word limit for coursework, and of the relevant year of the degree programme: the amount of supplementary material and degree of independent critical, analytical or synthetic treatment expected of a final year student are much higher than that expected in first year.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Answer is a <b>masterful exposition of the subject</b> , showing <b>command</b> of the relevant concepts and facts, normally including <b>considerable well-chosen supplementary material</b> , and providing <b>very good independent critical, analytical <u>and/or</u> synthetic treatment</b> of the information.
	95	
	90	
	85	Answer gives an excellent account of at virtually all of the expected relevant material. Shows excellent comprehension and application of the relevant concepts and facts. Provides <b>consistently analytical, critical <u>and/or</u> synthetic treatment of the information</b> and/or includes <b>considerable well-chosen supplementary material</b> .
	80	
	76	Answer gives an <b>excellent account of virtually all of the expected relevant material</b> . Shows excellent <b>comprehension <u>and</u> application</b> of the relevant concepts and facts. In addition, provides <b>some analytical, critical <u>and/or</u> synthetic treatment of the information</b> and/or includes <b>some relevant supplementary material</b> .
72		
2A	68	Answer gives a <b>well-organised, mainly accurate and well-written account</b> of the relevant concepts and facts, containing <b>at least two-thirds of the expected relevant material</b> . Demonstrates <b>comprehension <u>and/or</u> application</b> of the relevant concepts, and <b>lacks significant errors of understanding</b> . Coursework assignments must be <b>written concisely with appropriate and basically correct use of references</b> to attain a 2A mark or higher.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Answer gives an account of at least <b>one-half to two-thirds of the expected relevant material</b> , but is marred by defective organisation, omissions or errors that indicate a lack of clear understanding of the concepts. Coursework assignments that are <b>too long, poorly written</b> , and/or that show <b>inappropriate <u>and/or</u> incorrect use of references</b> are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Answer presents <b>one-third to one-half of the expected relevant material</b> , but is marred by major errors, brevity, and/or irrelevance.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Answer presents <b>one-quarter to one-third of the expected relevant material</b> (e.g. a sketchy outline of a correct answer), but is marred by major errors or brevity.
	35	
	30	
	25	Answer presents <b>more than three concepts or facts</b> but less than one-quarter of the expected relevant material and is too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the question.
	20	
	15	Answer presents only <b>three concepts or facts</b> that are correct and relevant to the question.
	10	Answer presents only <b>two concepts or facts</b> that are correct and relevant to the question.
	5	Answer presents at most <b>one concept or fact</b> that is correct and relevant to the question.
	0	Answer contains <b>nothing</b> that is both correct and relevant to the question. Mark given where the work presented is discovered not to be that of the candidate (plagiarised).

**Supplementary material** includes **outside reading** and material from other courses. For first- and second-year students, textbooks are an acceptable source of outside reading; for final-year students, outside reading should normally come from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, e.g. comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, e.g. evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. e.g. discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, e.g. explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, e.g. applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set.

## Essay: report and feedback

<p><b>Student's name, and title of essay</b> Place sticker here</p>	<p>Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement, presenting it as your own. Any plagiarism discovered in this work will result in a penalty, varying from deduction of marks to more serious disciplinary action, according to the severity of the offence. <b>By attaching this form to your work, you are declaring that this work is free from plagiarism</b> as defined by the college policy: <a href="http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences">http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences</a></p>	
<p><b>Partner/Group</b></p>		
<p><b>Marker</b></p>		
<p><b>How did this essay meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Complete? Accurate? Well organised? Well referenced? <i>etc.</i></p>		
<p><b>How might this essay – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?</p>		
<p><b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b></p>	<p><b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b></p>	<p><b>Agreed mark</b></p>
<p><b>Explanation of agreed mark</b></p>		

## Laboratory reports: assessment criteria

These criteria are for laboratory coursework, from first year to final year practical classes. Account is taken of the relevant year of the degree programme, the nature of the work, and the instructions provided. Due allowance is made for what is reasonably achievable under laboratory conditions and in the time available. Marks may be deducted for failure to attend all or part of a laboratory class.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Report demonstrates complete <b>command of the background and context</b> of the work, gives an accurate and logical account of the methods, presents and analyses the results with clarity, correctly applies any necessary mathematical/statistical techniques to the results, and provides <b>very good independent analytical and critical treatment</b> when discussing the methods, results, implications and limitations (with <b>supplementary material</b> showing evidence of substantial <b>outside reading</b> where appropriate).
	95	
	90	
	85	Practical completed successfully and report very well presented, without significant deficiencies.
	80	<b>Consistently analytical and critical treatment</b> of methods, results, implications, and limitations. <b>Evidence of outside reading where appropriate.</b>
	76	Practical completed successfully and report very well presented, without significant deficiencies.
	72	Provides <b>evidence of limited outside reading and/or some analytical and critical treatment</b> of methods, results, implications, and limitations.
2A	68	Report is <b>complete and mainly accurate, without significant errors of understanding or calculation</b> , demonstrating <b>comprehension</b> of the context, <b>methods and limitations</b> of the work. <b>Results are presented clearly.</b> Reports must be <b>written concisely</b> to attain a 2A mark or higher.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Report (i) shows a <b>reasonable grasp of the background and context</b> of the work, and (ii) gives an <b>accurate account of most of the experimental procedures and results</b> , but (iii) does not go beyond that, or does go beyond it but is marred by omissions or significant errors that indicate a lack of clear understanding of the techniques used. Reports that are <b>too long</b> and/or <b>poorly written</b> are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Report (i) shows only a relatively weak grasp of the background and context of the work and (ii) contains major errors or omissions, but (iii) presents a <b>mainly accurate account of at least a third of the experimental procedures and results.</b>
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Work (i) shows <b>partial understanding of the experiment</b> and (ii) presents <b>less than a third of the experimental procedures and results.</b>
	35	
	30	
	25	Report is (i) too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the practical and (ii) <b>presents only about a quarter of the procedures and results</b>
	20	
	15	Report presents only <b>two or three concepts or facts</b> that are relevant and correct.
	10	
	5	<b>Practical attempted</b> , but no relevant experimental procedures, results or discussion.
0	Practical not attempted, work not handed in or contains <b>nothing</b> correct that is relevant. Mark given where the work presented is discovered not to be that of the candidate (plagiarised). Further disciplinary action is usually taken in cases of plagiarism.	

**Supplementary material** includes **outside reading** and material from other courses. For first- and second-year students, textbooks are an acceptable source of outside reading; for final-year students, outside reading should normally come from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, e.g. comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, e.g. evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. e.g. discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, e.g. explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, e.g. applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set.

## Laboratory report: report and feedback

<b>Student's name, and title of laboratory report</b> Place sticker here	Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement, presenting it as your own. Any plagiarism discovered in this work will result in a penalty, varying from deduction of marks to more serious disciplinary action, according to the severity of the offence. <b>By attaching this form to your work, you are declaring that this work is free from plagiarism</b> as defined by the college policy: <a href="http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences">http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences</a>	
<b>Partner/Group</b>		
<b>Marker</b>		
<b>How did this laboratory report meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Data well presented and analysed? Limitations of methods identified? <i>etc.</i>		
<b>How might this laboratory report – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?		
<b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>		

## Posters: assessment criteria

These criteria are to be used for posters, including the mini-poster for the final year *Research Project*. Allowances will be made for what can reasonably be expected for the year of the degree: a poster of final year standard will not be expected from a first year student.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Poster does an excellent job of communicating the most important scientific information. It presents the information in an <b>eye-catching and visually attractive</b> way. The material is <b>laid out cleanly, logically and accessibly. Images (where present) are of high quality</b> . The content of the poster has been <b>well researched</b> and <b>correctly referenced</b> . The presenter(s) of the poster showed <b>command of the relevant concepts and facts</b> when explaining the poster and/or answering questions.
	95	
	90	
	85	Excellent poster, meeting all the criteria for a mark of 68 and <b>most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	80	
	76	Excellent poster, meeting all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
72		
2A	68	Poster is <b>attractive and laid out in a largely logical fashion</b> , very effectively communicating the significance of a body of scientific information. Posters in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: <b>appropriate background reading; some critical, analytical or synthetic treatment of the information; no evidence of significant errors of understanding</b> in the poster or when answering questions.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Poster conveys information adequately, but it is marred by omissions or errors, or is laid out in a way that significantly detracts from the content of the poster ( <i>e.g.</i> misplaced emphasis). Nonetheless, the poster or its presenter(s) <b>demonstrates understanding of most of the relevant expected material</b> .
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Poster is marred by major errors, brevity; irrelevance, or poor design (as laid out below); however, either the poster or its presenter(s) <b>demonstrates understanding of at least a third of the expected relevant material</b> .
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Poster demonstrates understanding of <b>less than a third of the expected relevant material</b> , and is marred by major errors, brevity, or inappropriate design. The presenter(s) did not answer questions well enough to convincingly demonstrate adequate knowledge and understanding.
	35	
	30	
	25	Poster demonstrates understanding of <b>less than a quarter of the expected relevant material</b> , whether through omission of material, poor execution ( <i>e.g.</i> , unlabelled figures) or errors. Typically the poster will show most of the following failings: inadequate graphics, illegibility, overcrowding, large gaps, missing abstract/summary, lack of attention to detail, lack of material.
	20	
	15	Poster is so poor as to indicate its presenter(s) did not understand what a poster is supposed to achieve. Conveys <b>much less than a quarter of the expected relevant material</b> .
	10	
	5	
0	Poster not produced.	

**Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models.

**Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g.* discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, *e.g.* explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, *e.g.* applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set.

## Poster: report and feedback

<b>Student/Group</b>		
<b>Title of poster</b>		
<b>Marker(s)</b>		
<b>How did this poster meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Logically laid-out? Visually appealing? Appropriate use of text and imagery? <i>etc.</i>		
<b>How might this poster – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?		
<b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>		

## Presentations: assessment criteria

These criteria are used to assess all oral presentations during your degree course, including those for final-year *Literature Projects* and *Research Projects*. Account is taken of the relevant year of the degree programme, the teaching of the subject, the instructions provided for the work and the type of presentation. Allowance is made for what is reasonably achievable under the conditions of the presentation (resources available, time allowed, whether group or individual presentation, *etc.*).

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a substantial body of scientific information. The presenter <b>held the audience's attention</b> , showed <b>command of the relevant concepts and facts</b> , <b>spoke authoritatively</b> , showed <b>evidence of substantial outside reading</b> (where appropriate), provided a <b>consistently analytical, critical and/or synthetic treatment</b> of the information (where relevant), gave <b>excellent answers to questions</b> , and showed <b>fluency in the use of any teaching aids</b> (PowerPoint, demonstrations, handouts, PRS clickers, <i>etc.</i> ). Any <b>visual aids were conference-level</b> .
	95	
	90	
	85	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a substantial body of scientific information. It meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68, as well as meeting <b>most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	80	
	76	
2A	72	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a substantial body of scientific information. It meets all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting <b>one or a few of the qualities of a 90+ presentation</b> .
	68	Presentation very effectively communicates a significant body of scientific information, being a <b>logically-structured exposition</b> enabling the audience to appreciate the significance of the material presented. Presentations in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: <b>appropriate background reading</b> , <b>good critical, analytical or synthetic treatment of the information</b> , <b>no evidence of significant errors of understanding</b> during the talk or in answers to questions, <b>used resources well</b> , <b>spoke without detailed notes</b> , <b>little or no hesitation</b> , <b>kept more or less to time</b> , <b>appropriately paced (neither too fast nor too slow)</b> .
	65	
62		
2B	58	Presentation successfully communicates a significant body of scientific information. It is a <b>mostly accurate account of most of the expected relevant material</b> , showing evidence of <b>some background reading</b> and <b>adequate preparation</b> , but is marred by confused sections, poor use of resources, over-run, omissions, errors, hesitation, irrelevance ( <i>e.g.</i> slides that do not add value), over-reliance on non-primary sources, by reading from notes.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Presentation achieves only limited communication of scientific information, containing major errors or omissions. Presenter delivers a <b>mainly accurate account of at least a third of the expected relevant material</b> , showing a generally weak understanding and evidence of little background reading or preparation.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Presentation fails to communicate any significant scientific information. Presenter demonstrates <b>understanding of less than a third of the expected relevant material</b> (either through errors, through lack of preparation, or by omission).
	35	
	30	
	25	Presentation fails to communicate scientific information and is on balance misleading. It shows <b>understanding of less than a quarter of the expected relevant material</b> , but is so inaccurate and/or irrelevant that it succeeds only in misinforming and confusing the audience.
	20	
	15	
	10	Presentation includes very little that is correct and relevant.
	5	
0		
	0	Presentation not given.

**Supplementary material** includes **outside reading** and material from other courses. For first- and second-year students, textbooks are an acceptable source of outside reading; for final-year students, outside reading should normally come from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g.* discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, *e.g.* explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, *e.g.* applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set.

## Presentation: report and feedback

<b>Student/Group</b>		
<b>Title of presentation</b>		
<b>Marker(s)</b>		
<b>How did this presentation meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Kept to time? Answers questions well? Good use of AV? Good pace? Engaging? <i>etc.</i>		
<b>How might this presentation – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?		
<b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>		

## Dissertations: assessment criteria

These criteria are for the second-year *Tutored Dissertation*, the *Critical Reviews for Year in Research Abroad* and *Year in Industry/Research* students, and final-year *Literature Projects*. Outside reading is fundamental in dissertations, forming most of the expected relevant material, so is not mentioned explicitly below. Textbooks may be a useful start for *Tutored Dissertations*, but most outside reading should be from the peer-reviewed literature, including primary research papers. Allowance will be made for the student's year of study and, for placements, the placement duration.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Dissertation is of sufficient quality and scientific novelty to submit to an international peer-reviewed journal.
	95	Dissertation is a <b>succinct survey of the most important relevant primary literature</b> , with <b>thoughtful selection of relevant material</b> and <b>real attention to detail</b> (in references, figures, etc.). The dissertation provides <b>consistently analytical and critical treatment</b> of the information and <b>independently synthesises a structured argument and/or novel testable hypothesis</b> . Any necessary mathematical, statistical or bioinformatic techniques are <b>described logically and applied knowledgeably</b> , and <b>any results or meta-analyses are presented in a publishable format</b> .
	90	
	85	Dissertation meets all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting <b>most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	80	
	76	
	72	Dissertation meets all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting <b>one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
2A	68	Dissertation is a <b>very good, logically structured exposition of the subject</b> , showing a <b>clear grasp of the relevant concepts and facts</b> . It provides some <b>critical, analytical or synthetic treatment</b> of the information and is <b>well-presented</b> . Dissertations must be <b>written concisely</b> with appropriate and basically <b>correct use of references</b> to attain a 2A mark or higher.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Dissertation gives a good and <b>mostly accurate account of most of the subject area</b> , showing a <b>grasp of the basic concepts and facts</b> , but does not go beyond that or goes beyond it but is marred by significant errors. Dissertations in this range are likely to show fairly extensive reliance on non-primary sources (e.g. reviews), and a lack of insight into or failure to comprehend parts of the subject matter. Dissertations that are <b>too long, poorly written</b> , and/or that show inappropriate and/or <b>incorrect use of references</b> are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Dissertation is just acceptable, <b>demonstrating basic understanding of more than a third of the expected amount of relevant material</b> , but does not identify and use sufficient relevant source material, and/or presents material in an inconsistent, incomplete, incorrect or unscientific way. Dissertations in this range are likely to lack clear structure, to be written in an unscientific style, and to be marred by significant errors.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Dissertation demonstrates understanding of <b>less than a third of the expected amount of relevant material</b> , because of brevity, misunderstanding and/or errors in presentation. It shows insufficient understanding of the literature for degree level.
	35	
	30	
	25	Dissertation demonstrates understanding of <b>less than a quarter of the expected amount of relevant material</b> , because of brevity, misunderstanding and/or errors in presentation.
	20	
	15	Dissertation contains <b>only a few sentences that are correct</b> and relevant to the subject.
	10	
	5	
0	Dissertation not handed in or contains <b>nothing</b> of relevance to the subject.	

**Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, e.g. comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, e.g. evaluating two competing models.

**Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. e.g. discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, e.g. explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, e.g. applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set.

## ***Tutored Dissertation: Tutor's report and feedback***

<b>Student</b>	
<b>Title of <i>Tutored Dissertation</i></b>	
<b>Tutor</b>	
<b>Dates of meetings</b>	
<b>How did this dissertation meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Well organised? Well researched and referenced? Informative figures/tables? <i>etc.</i>	
<b>How might this dissertation – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?	
<b>Please use table overleaf for mark awarded and signature</b>	

**Students are not given their marks immediately and DO NOT SEE this side of the sheet. This side is for comments regarding moderation or agreement of marks.**

**Please contact the Second Marker to agree a mark: transcribe their Second Marker's grade, and add the agreed grade into the boxes below. Please give an explanation of the agreed mark below.**

<b>Tutor's mark &amp; initials</b>	<b>Second Marker's mark &amp; initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
--	--	--------------------

## ***Tutored Dissertation: Second Marker's report and feedback***

<b>Student</b>	
<b>Title of <i>Tutored Dissertation</i></b>	
<b>Second Marker</b>	
<b>How did this dissertation meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Well organised? Well researched and referenced? Informative figures/tables? <i>etc.</i>	
<b>How might this dissertation – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?	
<b>Please use table overleaf for mark awarded and signature</b>	

**Students are not given their marks immediately and DO NOT SEE this side of the sheet.**

**Please contact the Tutor to agree a mark: the Tutor's mark-sheet has a space for the explanation of this agreed mark**

	<b>Second Marker's mark &amp; initials</b>	
--	--	--

## Research Project and Literature Project vivas: assessment criteria

These criteria are used to assess oral vivas of final-year practical *Research Projects* and Literature Projects.

Class	%	Criteria	
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	The student did an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. The student <b>gave accurate and logical answers</b> , showed <b>command of the relevant concepts and facts</b> , <b>spoke authoritatively</b> , showed <b>abundant evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and /or presentation</b> , provided a <b>consistently analytical, critical and/or synthetic treatment</b> information in their answers (where relevant). The student <b>demonstrated an appreciation of the limitations</b> of the experimental or other procedures, and <b>showed clear and possibly novel insight</b> into the subject. The student was able <b>robustly to defend criticism of the strategy, ideas or information</b> provided in the dissertation and / or the presentation.	
	95		
	90		
	85		
	80		They met all of the criteria for a mark of 68, and met <b>most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	76		The student did an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information.
	72	They met all the criteria for a mark of 68 and met <b>one or a few of the qualities of a 90+ presentation</b> .	
2A	68	The student effectively communicated a significant body of scientific information, enabling the examiner to appreciate the significance of the material presented. Vivas in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: <b>good evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and /or presentation</b> , <b>good critical, analytical or synthetic ability</b> in developing answers to questions, <b>no evidence of significant errors of understanding</b> during answers to questions, <b>sound knowledge of how the study fits in to the relevant literature</b> and <b>some ability to defend criticism of the strategy, ideas or information</b> provided in the dissertation and / or presentation.	
	65		
	62		
2B	58	The student successfully communicated a body of scientific information. The viva revealed a <b>mostly accurate understanding of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation</b> , showing evidence of <b>adequate preparation</b> , but was marred by some confused answers, omissions, errors, hesitation or irrelevance. There was <b>little evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and / or presentation</b> .	
	55		
	52		
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	The student achieved only limited communication of scientific information, with major errors or omissions. The student demonstrated an <b>understanding of at least a third of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation</b> , but showed little evidence of preparation. There was <b>no evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and / or presentation</b> .	
	45		
	42		
Fail	38	The student failed to communicate any significant scientific information. The student demonstrated <b>understanding of less than a third of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation</b> (either through errors, or by omission).	
	35		
	30		
	25	The student failed to communicate scientific information and was on balance misleading. They demonstrated <b>understanding of less than a quarter of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation</b> , but answers were so inaccurate and/or irrelevant that they succeeded only in largely misinforming and confusing the examiner.	
	20		
	15	The student provided few or no answers that were correct and relevant.	
	10		
	5		
0	Viva not attended.		

**Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, e.g. comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, e.g. evaluating two competing models.

**Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. e.g. discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, e.g. explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, e.g. applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set..

## **Research Project and Literature Project presentation and viva: report**

<b>Student</b>			
<b>Title of project</b>			
<b>First Examiner</b>			
<b>Second Examiner</b>			
<b>Date of presentation and viva</b>			
<b>Presentation</b>			
Structure of presentation, emphasis of important points	<i>disorganised</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>logically organised, clear emphasis</i>
Amount of material	<i>too little or too much</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>appropriate</i>
Quality of text and images on slides	<i>too much, can't read</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>excellent visibility</i>
Timekeeping	<i>poor</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>excellent</i>
Rapport with audience	<i>poor</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>lively, good eye contact</i>
<b>How did this presentation meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>			
<b>How might this presentation have gained a higher grade?</b>			
<b>First Examiner's mark &amp; initials</b>	<b>Second Examiner's mark &amp; initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>	
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>			

Please turn over for Viva assessment

<b>Viva</b>			
Understanding of methods	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Understanding of results	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Understanding of core material and theory associated with project	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Broader understanding of the subject area	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Ideas for further research	<i>none</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>plenty</i>
<b>How did this viva meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>			
<b>How might this viva have gained a higher grade?</b>			
<b>First Examiner's mark &amp; initials</b>	<b>Second Examiner's mark &amp; initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>	
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>			

## Literature Project: Supervisor/Examiner's report

<b>Student</b>			
<b>Title of project</b>			
<b>Marker</b>			
<b>Date</b>			
<b>Thesis</b>			
Presentation	<i>messy, poor English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Abstract	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Introduction	<i>trivial</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publishable</i>
Literature coverage	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>extensive and deep</i>
Accuracy of the information	<i>major errors omissions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>full command of the material</i>
Figures/legends/tables	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear, complete</i>
Discussion	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
References	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>fully accurate</i>
Analytical/critical skills	<i>poor</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>outstanding</i>
Understanding/insight	<i>very little</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
Scientific rigor	<i>weak</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>strict</i>
<b>How did this thesis meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>			
<b>How might this thesis have gained a higher grade?</b>			
<b>Examiner's mark &amp; initials</b>			

## Research Project theses: assessment criteria

These criteria are to be used for final-year *Research Projects* and also for *Year in Research Abroad Scientific Reports*. Outside reading is fundamental when writing up a research project, so is not mentioned explicitly in the criteria that follow. Most outside reading should be from the peer-reviewed scientific literature, including primary research papers.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Thesis is of <b>sufficient quality to submit for publication to an international peer-reviewed journal</b> (assuming, ideally, that positive and negative results have equal merit).
	95	Thesis is close to a publishable standard, containing a <b>succinct survey of the most important primary literature</b> and an <b>accurate and logical account and justification of the methods used</b> . It presents the <b>results in a publishable format</b> , and knowledgeably applies <b>any necessary mathematical and/or statistical techniques</b> . Discussion of results demonstrates <b>high levels of rigour and critical ability</b> in the context of the relevant literature. Thesis <b>demonstrates an appreciation the limitations</b> of the experimental or other procedures, shows <b>attention to detail</b> (in references, figures, <i>etc.</i> ), and <b>shows clear and possibly novel insight</b> into the subject.
	90	
	85	Excellent thesis, meeting all of the criteria for a mark of 68 and <b>most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	80	
	76	Excellent thesis, meeting all the criteria for a mark of 68 and <b>one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
72		
2A	68	Very good, <b>well-structured</b> thesis <b>written in good scientific style</b> ( <i>i.e.</i> in clear, concise, direct, precise, dispassionate scientific English, including all important details). It shows the following features: (i) an ability to <b>carry out experimental procedures successfully</b> to generate original results (which may be negative and need not be novel); (ii) a <b>very good understanding of the study design and the methods used</b> to generate and analyse the data; (iii) <b>appropriate – if not high-level – analyses</b> ; (iv) <b>clear presentation of results</b> ; (v) <b>sound knowledge of how the study fits in to the relevant literature</b> ; (vi) <b>some critical interpretation</b> of the results and the study overall.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Good thesis showing the following features: (i) an <b>ability to follow experimental procedures</b> ; (ii) <b>basic understanding of the relevant concepts and methods</b> ; (iii) <b>mostly logical structure and scientific style</b> ; (iv) <b>reasonable interpretation</b> of the data or information collected; and (iv) a <b>reasonable attempt to relate the results to the contemporary literature</b> . Theses that are <b>too long, poorly written</b> , and/or that show <b>poor use of references</b> are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Acceptable thesis showing the following features: (i) an <b>ability to follow some experimental procedures</b> ; (ii) a <b>weak grasp of most of the relevant concepts and methods</b> ; (iii) <b>need for close guidance in design and interpretation</b> ; and (iv) at best <b>limited relation of the results to the relevant literature</b> . Research projects in this bracket are likely to be marred by significant errors, important omissions, brevity and/or a failure to interpret the data critically.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Poor thesis showing the following features: (i) <b>understanding of less than half of the theoretical basis of the project</b> ; (ii) <b>evidence of widespread difficulty following procedures</b> to generate and analyse data; (iii) need for <b>complete instruction in design and interpretation</b> ; (iv) <b>does not relate the outcome of the experimental work to the literature</b> .
	35	
	30	
	25	Thesis <b>contains more than a few relevant sentences</b> but shows very little understanding of the background to the project, the project design, or the methods used to generate or analyse the data. Students in this bracket are unlikely to have been able to carry out even basic procedures, despite proper instruction.
	20	
	15	Thesis contains <b>only a few sentences relevant to the subject</b> , and does not contain any interpretable results.
	10	
	5	
0	Thesis contains <b>nothing</b> relevant or was not submitted.	

## Research Project thesis: Examiner's report

<b>Student</b>			
<b>Title of project</b>			
<b>Examiner</b>			
<b>Date</b>			
<b>Thesis</b>			
Presentation	<i>messy, poor English</i>	□□□□□	<i>publication standard</i>
Abstract	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	□□□□□	<i>publication standard</i>
Introduction	<i>trivial</i>	□□□□□	<i>publishable</i>
Literature coverage	<i>very shallow</i>	□□□□□	<i>extensive and deep</i>
Description of aims	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	□□□□□	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Materials and methods	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	□□□□□	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Description of results	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	□□□□□	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Figures/legends/tables	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	□□□□□	<i>perfectly clear, complete</i>
Quality of data	<i>poor</i>	□□□□□	<i>new and publishable</i>
Analysis of data	<i>very shallow</i>	□□□□□	<i>full stats, etc</i>
Discussion	<i>very shallow</i>	□□□□□	<i>publication standard</i>
References	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	□□□□□	<i>fully accurate</i>
Understanding/insight	<i>very little</i>	□□□□□	<i>research level</i>
Scientific rigor	<i>weak</i>	□□□□□	<i>strict</i>
<b>How did this thesis meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>			
<b>How might this thesis have gained a higher grade?</b>			
<b>Examiner's mark &amp; initials</b>			

## Research Project lab/field-work performance: assessment criteria

Class	%	Criteria	
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Student <b>worked safely, confidently, diligently, and designed appropriate investigations</b> . Student developed a <b>high level of technical expertise</b> . Student <b>kept supervisor informed of progress, but consistently showed initiative</b> and did not require micromanagement. Student <b>contributed very positively to the research group</b> .	
	95		
	90		
	85	80	Student met all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>most of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b>
		76	Student met all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	72		
	2A	68	Student's <b>lab or field work was performed competently</b> . The student <b>contributed meaningfully to the experimental design</b> , worked reasonably hard, <b>picked up procedures well</b> , and was <b>able to work largely independently</b> .
65			
62			
2B	58	Student's lab or field work was <b>performed safely throughout</b> . The student had <b>some input into experimental design</b> and <b>worked reasonably hard</b> . The student was <b>able to work usefully with only day-to-day supervision from anyone</b> .	
	55		
	52		
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Student showed <b>some ability to follow experimental procedures without close supervision</b> and <b>appreciated safety aspects</b> , but the <b>work was small in quantity and poorly executed</b> . Student's <b>input into experimental design was minimal</b> .	
	45		
	42		
Fail	38	Student worked for <b>up to a half of the expected time</b> and <b>worked safely/adequately only when very closely supervised</b> . Student showed <b>very little or no initiative or independence</b> .	
	35		
	30		
	25	Student <b>attended the laboratory of field site for up to a third of the expected time</b> and performed <b>some work safely/adequately but only when micromanaged</b> . <b>Very little useful work completed</b> .	
	20		
	15	Student <b>attended the laboratory or field site</b> but either attended for less than a quarter of the expected time or worked in an unsafe or otherwise wholly unsatisfactory fashion despite proper instruction. <b>Negligible amount of work completed</b> .	
	10		
5			
0	Student <b>did not attend</b> the laboratory or field site, was barred for preventable reasons (e.g., an unacceptable attitude to safety), or was found to have fabricated results.		

## Research Project: Supervisor's report

<b>Student</b>			
<b>Title of project</b>			
<b>Examiner</b>			
<b>Date</b>			
<b>Thesis</b>			
Presentation	<i>messy, poor English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Abstract	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Introduction	<i>trivial</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publishable</i>
Literature coverage	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>extensive and deep</i>
Description of aims	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Materials and methods	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Description of results	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Figures/legends/tables	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear, complete</i>
Quality of data	<i>poor</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>new and publishable</i>
Analysis of data	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>full stats, etc</i>
Discussion	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
References	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>fully accurate</i>
Understanding/insight	<i>very little</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
Scientific rigor	<i>weak</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>strict</i>
<b>How did this thesis meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>			
<b>How might this thesis have gained a higher grade?</b>			
<b>Supervisor's mark &amp; initials</b>			

Please turn over for lab/field-work performance assessment

<b>Lab/field-work performance</b>			
How diligently did the student work?	<i>indolently</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>intensively</i>
How well did the student plan/design the experiments	<i>slapdash</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>research level</i>
How well were the experimental methods and results documented (e.g. in lab book)?	<i>slapdash</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>research level</i>
How well did the student observe the relevant safety procedures (e.g. wear lab coat)?	<i>never</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>always</i>
How accurate was the student's experimental technique?	<i>slapdash</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>research level</i>
How well did the student interpret the data?	<i>poorly</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>research level</i>
Quantity of work done	<i>very little</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>A great deal</i>
<b>How did the student's performance meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>			
<b>How might this student's performance have gained a higher grade?</b>			
<b>Supervisor's mark &amp; initials</b>			

## Literature Project lay summary: assessment criteria

A synopsis of the final year *Literature Project* which is written for the adult general public (presumed to a broadsheet newspaper reader with a basic grasp of science).

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	The summary is audience-appropriate and gives a <b>masterful synopsis of the literature report</b> , showing <b>total command</b> of the most salient concepts and facts to be put across and is written in clear, engaging prose.
	95	
	90	
	85	
	80	The summary meets all the requirements describe above but shows very minor deficiencies in one aspect.
	76	
	72	
2A	68	The summary gives a <b>well-organised and audience-appropriate synopsis of the literature report</b> . It demonstrates a mostly accurate account of the most salient concepts and facts to be put across and is written in clear prose. It <b>lacks significant errors of understanding</b> .
	65	
	62	
2B	58	The summary delivers a largely accurate <b>synopsis of the literature report</b> or, while accurate, is written in a style that is not completely suited to the target audience, or is marred by defective organisation, omissions or errors that indicate a lack of clear understanding of the purpose of the lay summary.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	The summary is not audience-appropriate in style <b>or</b> is poorly organised <b>or</b> fails to highlight the salient concepts and facts from the literature report.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	The summary is not audience-appropriate <b>and</b> fails to include the salient points of the literature report. It lacks clarity and is marred by major errors, brevity, and/or irrelevance.
	35	
	30	
	25	The summary is too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the topic or of the audience.
	20	
	15	The summary presents <b>less than three relevant sentences</b> and is too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the topic or of the audience.
	10	
	5	
0	The article contains <b>nothing</b> that is both correct and relevant to the literature report. Mark given where the work presented is discovered not to be that of the candidate (plagiarised).	

## Literature Project lay summary: report

<b>Student's name, and title of lay summary</b> Place sticker here	Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement, presenting it as your own. Any plagiarism discovered in this work will result in a penalty, varying from deduction of marks to more serious disciplinary action, according to the severity of the offence. <b>By attaching this form to your work, you are declaring that this work is free from plagiarism</b> as defined by the college policy: <a href="http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences">http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences</a>	
<b>Marker</b>		
<b>How did this lay summary meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Accurate? Pitched appropriately to a 'broadsheet' audience? Avoids excessive jargon? <i>etc.</i>		
<b>How might this lay summary have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?		
<b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>		

## ***Year in Industry/Research, Year in Research Abroad, and Language for Science project report: assessment criteria***

Allowances will be made for whether the student was in the second or third year of the degree programme when the placement was completed and whether the placement was for a period of six months or a year.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Placement account shows that the student has <b>taken full advantage of all training opportunities</b> offered by the employing institution, has undertaken <b>independent initiatives to obtain further training or scientific work</b> during the placement, and <b>can communicate scientific information about work carried out during the placement in a consistently engaging style</b> appropriate to the nature of the work and the information obtained.
	95	
	90	
	85	Placement account meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>fully meeting two of the criteria for a mark of 90+ or partially meeting all three.</b>
	80	
	76	Placement account meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>fully meeting one of the criteria for a mark of 90+ or partially meeting two.</b>
	72	
2A	68	Placement account shows that the student has <b>completed the programme of scientific work</b> allocated to them by the employing institution, <b>acquired the skills and experience appropriate to that work</b> , and has provided a <b>clear, structured and scientific account of the work</b> carried out during the placement, in an appropriate style. Placement accounts must be <b>written concisely</b> with appropriate and basically <b>correct use of references</b> to attain a 2A mark or higher.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Placement account shows that the student has <b>at least very nearly completed the programme of scientific work</b> allocated to them by the employing institution, <b>acquired most of the skills and experience</b> appropriate to the work, and has provided a <b>clear account of the work</b> carried out during the placement, <b>written in an appropriate style.</b> Placement accounts that are <b>too long, poorly written</b> , and/or that show inappropriate and/or <b>incorrect use of references</b> are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Placement account shows that the student has <b>completed satisfactorily most of the programme of scientific work</b> allocated to them by the employing institution (circumstances outside the student's control should be taken account) has <b>acquired some of the scientific, organisational or other relevant skills and experience</b> during the placement, and has provided a basic if flawed account of the work carried out during the placement.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Placement account contains <b>less than a third of the expected relevant material</b> about the placement, shows no more than a slight understanding of the scientific background, shows that <b>some but not most of the programme of scientific work was completed satisfactorily</b> (circumstances outside the student's control should be taken into account), and does not demonstrate the acquisition of relevant skills.
	35	
	30	
	25	Placement account contains <b>less than a quarter of the expected relevant material</b> about the placement, and shows very little or no understanding of the scientific background.
	20	
	15	Placement account contains <b>only a few relevant sentences</b> about the placement.
	10	
	5	
0	No placement account was submitted, or the account contains <b>nothing</b> relevant to the work carried out during the placement.	

## ***Year in Industry/Research, Year in Research Abroad, and Language for Science* project report: report and feedback**

<b>Student</b>		
<b>Title of <i>Project Report</i></b>		
<b>Marker</b>		
<p><b>How did this report meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b>          Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Well organised? Well researched and referenced? Informative figures/tables? <i>etc.</i></p>		
<p><b>How might this report – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b>          How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?</p>		
<b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>		

## Year in Research Abroad cultural report: assessment criteria

The cultural report is on a specific topic related to any aspect of the cultural life (social, artistic, political, economic) of the country or region the student is in.

Class	%	Criteria
1 <sup>st</sup>	100	Cultural report is of <b>publishable quality</b> , and is <b>written in the style of an authoritative article</b> in a 'quality' newspaper or magazine ( <i>e.g. The Times, Guardian, Economist</i> ).
	95	Cultural report is a <b>comprehensive survey of the relevant literature</b> , with <b>thoughtful selection of relevant material</b> (at least some of which is primary) and <b>consistent attention to detail</b> (in references, figures, <i>etc.</i> ). The cultural report demonstrates a consistently analytical or critical <b>treatment</b> of the information and <b>independently synthesises a structured argument</b> .
	90	
	85	Cultural report meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>most of the criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
	80	
	76	Cultural report meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <b>one or a few criteria for a mark of 90+</b> .
72		
2A	68	Cultural report is a <b>very good exposition of the subject</b> , showing the following attributes: (i) <b>logical structure</b> ; (ii) <b>appropriate writing style</b> ; (iii) <b>disciplined exploration and use of literature sources</b> ; and (iv) some <b>critical, analytical or synthetic</b> treatment of the information. Cultural reports must be <b>written concisely</b> with appropriate and basically <b>correct use of references</b> to attain a 2A mark or higher.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Cultural report gives a <b>largely complete account of the subject area</b> , showing at least <b>limited understanding of most of the material</b> . Reports in this bracket are likely to show evidence of extensive reliance on non-primary sources ( <i>e.g. books, magazines, newspapers</i> ), and of lack of insight into or failure to comprehend parts of the subject matter. Cultural reports that are <b>too long, poorly written</b> , and/or that show inappropriate and/or <b>incorrect acknowledgement of sources</b> are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.
	55	
	52	
3 <sup>rd</sup>	48	Cultural report is acceptable, with <b>more than half of the expected amount of content</b> , but does not identify and use sufficient relevant source material, and/or presents them in an inconsistent, incomplete or imprecise way. Reports in this bracket are likely to lack clear structure, to be written in an inappropriate style, and to be marred by significant errors.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Cultural report has <b>less than half of the expected amount of content</b> and shows little understanding of the literature. Reports in this bracket or below are likely to have been carelessly produced and poorly referenced.
	35	
	30	
	25	Cultural report contains <b>more than a few correct relevant sentences</b> , but is unacceptably brief, shows very little understanding of the literature and is very poorly referenced.
	20	
	15	Cultural report contains only a <b>few correct relevant</b> sentences.
	10	
	5	
0	Cultural report not submitted or contains <b>nothing</b> correct that is of relevance to the subject.	

## ***Year in Research Abroad* cultural report: report and feedback**

<b>Student</b>		
<b>Title of <i>Cultural Report</i></b>		
<b>Marker</b>		
<b>How did this report meet the criteria for the grade it has been given?</b> Which criteria <i>were</i> met? Well organised? Well researched and referenced? Informative figures/tables? <i>etc.</i>		
<b>How might this report – and similar work in future – have gained a higher grade?</b> How might some of the criteria that weren't met have <i>been</i> met?		
<b>First mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Second mark &amp; marker's initials</b>	<b>Agreed mark</b>
<b>Explanation of agreed mark</b>		